DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 553 SP 010 730

TITLE Humanizing the Educational Environment: A Goal for the Third Century. Info-Item Educators Digest/ No. 2072.

INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.; Ohio Education Association, Columbus. Instruction and Professional Development Div.

NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Enrichment; Culturally Disadvantaged; *Educational Environment; Educational Needs; Futures (of Society); *Human Dignity; *Humanization; *Human Relations; Individual Development; Interpersonal Relationship; Moral Values; *Racial Discrimination; *Sex Discrimination; Student Teacher Relationship; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

Four monographs on the subject of humanizing the educational environment are presented in this booklet. The first defines the commitment of the Ohio Education Association to humanizing education and describes the goals and values set for future education. The second discusses the "deprived" child, and the ramifications of this word in terms of the emotional and spiritual, as well as the material, emphasizing individual differences in background and culture in each pupil and the necessity for teachers to understand these factors in answering the needs of the child. In the third article the subject of human rights is examined in the negative framework of discrimination against women and blacks. The point is made that until these two groups are fully recognized, not as groups but as human beings, society itself suffers the loss of deep potential resources and progress. Human relations are assessed in the final article. The necessity for clear communication and awareness of individual differences and needs is stressed, with particular emphasis on the importance of sensitivity to others' reactions and recognition of their dignity and rights as human beings. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134553

IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD
IPD

Info-Item
Educators Digest/ #2072

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Humanizing the Educational Environment: A Goal for the Third Century

SP 010 730

distributed by:
Instruction and Professional Development Division
Ohio Education Association/National Education Association

OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT: Sally Savage

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: E. Wade Underwood

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Robert E. Miner

INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

DIRECTOR - ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESOLUTIONS:

Dr. Edward F. Jirik
Eileen Batey - Secretary
Bobbi Ceisler - Conference Specialist

ASSOCIATE FOR INFORMATIONAL SERVICES AND AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS:

Byron H. Marlowe
Karen Kerr - Secretary
Judy Catalina - Information Specialist

ASSOCIATE FOR INVESTIGATORY SERVICES (PR&R and TEPS):

James F. Brehm
Kathy Newman - Secretary

ASSOCIATE FOR HUMAN RELATIONS AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION:

Ramon H. MacFarlane
Sheila Valentine - Secretary

REPORT DIRECTOR: Ramon H. MacFarlane

DISTRIBUTION: This booklet was printed by the Ohio Education Association as an informational item for local association leaders.

HUMANIZING THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT:
A GOAL FOR THE THIRD CENTURY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 1

FOR THE OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: YESTERDAY IS TODAY

Ramon H. MacFarlane: IPD Associate for Human Relations and Affirmative Action, The Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio (representing OEA as recipient of the 1976 NEA Rosena J. Willis Memorial Award 2

HUMANIZING THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT FOR THE DEPRIVED CHILD

Dr. Charles A. Glatt: (deceased), Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Desegregation expert and Founder of the Foundation For Equality in Education and Recipient for the 1976 NEA H. Councill Trenholm Memorial Award 5

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE INDIVISIBLE

Dr. Wilma Scott-Heide: Twice Past President, The National Organization of Women and Chairperson. Keynote Speaker at the 1976 OEA Conference on Affirmative Action 11

HUMAN RELATIONS: A PRO-ACTIVE TOOL FOR HUMANIZING THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Phyllis B. Greer: Human Relations Director (retired), The Dayton Public School System, Dayton, Ohio - Consultant in Human Relations and Vice President for the Foundation for Equality in Education, Columbus, Ohio; Recipient, 1976 Human Relations Commission Award 15

INTRODUCTION

The Ohio Education Association's interest in human relations and the reaffirmation of its commitment to humanizing education has been reflected by a human relations program that has expanded from a policy statement in 1960 to a sophisticated program in 1976. The Instruction and Professional Development Division of the OEA has issued numerous human relations publications, sponsored regional and urban affairs seminars, conducted statewide human relations conferences, designed minority involvement seminars, and held a variety of workshops addressing Title IX and Women's Rights.

This booklet, *Humanizing Education: A Goal For The Third Century*, was presented to the Ohio Education Association at the 114th Annual Convention of the National Education Association held in Miami Beach, Florida, June 26 through July 1, 1976.

The Rosena J. Willis Memorial Awards which honors the state and local NEA affiliate having the most outstanding human relations program nationwide, were presented to the Lorain Education Association (local NEA affiliate) of Lorain, Ohio and to the Ohio Education Association (state NEA affiliate) at the 10th Annual Human Rights Awards Dinner held June 28, 1976 at the Deauville Hotel in Miami Beach.

The collection of monographs contained in this booklet reflect the contributions made by several individuals, who in a variety of different ways, have spoken at OEA Human Relations Conferences to the need for humanizing education not only for today, but for tomorrow as well. Since humanizing the educational environment will require a renewed commitment on the part of all educators, it was felt that this thrust should continue to be our goal for the Third Century.

It is with a great deal of pride and humility, that we in the Instruction and Professional Development Division of the Ohio Education Association commit to you, the reader of this booklet, the charge to continue the unfinished business of humanizing education in the Third Century.

Since one way of judging the future is by what has been accomplished in the past, we are prefacing the presentation of the monographs with an overview of OEA's dedication to the promotion of human and civil rights. This overview, written by an IPD staff member, accompanied the supportive data that placed the Ohio Education Association in nomination for the Rosena J. Willis Memorial Award.

It is our hope that this booklet will provide the incentive to continue the tasks that remain as a part of the unfinished agenda for the seventies.

"For The Ohio Education Association: Yesterday Is Today!"

by Ramon H. MacFarlane
IPD Associate for Human Relations
Instruction and Professional Development Division
Ohio Education Association

In 1963, Dr. Walton B. Bliss, OEA Executive Secretary Emeritus, authored a History of the Ohio Education Association entitled, *The Deeds of Teachers' Years*. In the forward of that book, Dr. Bliss states that:

> *" . . . the most striking thing about looking back to our beginnings and to the goals set for the organization at its dawning is the feeling you get of their timeliness -- or, really, their timelessness. No later than the fourth year (1851) of the Ohio State Teachers' Association, we hear from the Executive Committee that it seeks to build a strong public sentiment for schools, to promote the adoption of a better plan of school organization, and to improve teachers and elevate the profession of teaching. Today -- and doubtless tomorrow -- you expect your organization to seek these same broad goals. You live in an era when good public relations are paramount."*

As Dr. Bliss indicated in the aforementioned comments, we at OEA, feel that our *"yesterday is today"* and we would like to share how human relations, both in philosophy and in practice, has brought all of us at OEA to this specific moment in time.

"The History of Important Professional Goals Is That They Are Seldom Reached On The First Try."

With OEA's commitment to " . . . promote and protect human and civil rights," (as excerpted from the Preamble to the Constitution of the Ohio Education Association), OEA "cast the die" that was to produce the human relations thrust that became reality in the 1960's when civil rights became a critical issue in education.

In reflecting upon the many resolutions passed at OEA Representative Assemblies since 1960, we see the embodiment of an "integration Policy Statement" that came about as a part of some thirteen resolutions which served to delineate the seventeen categories that made up the Association's platform in 1960.

From 1961 through 1964, the human relations thrust, although not yet clearly defined, managed to remain alive through several continuing resolutions dealing with such areas as Civic Responsibilities, the Curriculum, and Protection of Democracy.

In 1965, the OEA's Department of Classroom Teachers adopted an official position relative to the qualities that the competent teacher should possess signaling one of the first calls for humanizing the educational environment.

In October, 1969, the OEA Urban Affairs Committee was created to meet the special needs of Urban Education. They designed the brochure, *Three Steps Toward Solving Ohio's Urban School Problem.* With their focus fully fixed on addressing problems associated with urban education, the Committee co-sponsored (in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Education) three urban affairs regional seminars that were held in Shaker Heights, Cincinnati, and Columbus, Ohio. The theme for these regional seminars were: *Teacher Behavior and the Disadvantaged.* In August of 1970, a Position Paper prepared by the OEA Committee on Urban Affairs was presented to the OEA Executive Committee who adopted it at its August 29-30, 1970 Committee Meeting.

In 1971, *Desegregation In The Public Schools* and *Human Relations In The Schools* appeared as two of forty-five (new) current resolutions included in the 1971 Resolutions Committee Report. As a result of Representative Assembly action taken in December, 1971, the OEA Human Relations Commission was established as the vehicle to promote the continuing thrust of the Ohio Education Association in facilitating greater communication among people, in enhancing self-improvement, and in bringing about a change of attitudes through an increased tolerance to differences which can and do inhibit the educational process.

In keeping with this charge, the OEA employed its first Director of Human Relations and housed that unit within the newly reorganized Instruction and Professional Development Division. As a resource guide for the membership, the Human Relations Section published a booklet entitled *Human Relations*, a monograph by the OEA Human Relations Commission, and two brochures entitled *Human Relations Serves You* and *Solving Ohio's Human Relations Problems.*

March, 1972, saw the last series of *Seminars For Inner-City Schools* being conducted by the OEA Urban Affairs Committee and saw the announcement of one of several conferences, *Cracks In The Urban Wall*, conducted by a tri-sponsorship of The Midwest Institute For Equal Educational Opportunities (a federal program funded through ESAA) housed at The Ohio State University, The Faculty of Educational Development, Columbus, Ohio; and the OEA Urban Affairs Committee. The OEA's first Human Relations Conference was held in this month also.

In November of 1973, the Ohio Education Association took yet another step toward effecting more positive human relations within and among all members of our pluralistic society when the OEA Executive Committee adopted a policy on "Desegregation and Affirmative Action." In August, 1974, the OEA reaffirmed its commitment to equal opportunity by developing a document that addressed itself to the vexing problems incidental to the discriminatory practices existent in sex-role stereotyping and racism inequalities. It also created the position of Curriculum and Instructional Organizational Consultant in the OEA Instruction and Professional Development Division to promote OEA's commitment to quality integrated education. As a result of this new thrust, the Ohio Education Association joined with the Ohio Civil Rights Commission in May of 1974 to sponsor its first Statewide Human Relations and Affirmative Action Seminar.

In the Fall of 1974, the Human Relations program thrust shifted slightly to encompass the UTP theme of *Together We Can.* With the onset of this new thrust, a new brochure was designed and a new booklet entitled *Human Relations Guidelines* was printed to reflect the four races of man. In March of 1975, the second

Statewide Human Relations Seminar on Affirmative Action was held in Columbus, Ohio and spoke to such issues as *Desegregation Mainstreaming The Handicapped,* and *Sex-Role Stereotyping.*

During this same period of time, the Ohio Education Association had also sponsored several workshops under the auspices of the OEA Womens Caucus and had coordinated a Minority Involvement Program thrust developed by the NEA Teacher Rights Division for Ohio's minority educators. In April of 1975, the third Annual Human Relations Conference was held in Columbus, Ohio. The theme selected by the OEA Human Relations Commission for this Conference was *"Understanding: The Pulse of Togetherness."*

Near the end of the year (December 1, 1974), tragedy struck the Ohio Education Association and the Human Relations Section. Mrs. Doris L. Allen, Human Relations Director, for just over one year, was killed en route to Washington, D.C., to attend an NEA Teacher Rights training function. With the passing of Mrs. Allen, the Human Relations Section was officially renamed *The Doris L. Allen Intercultural Relations Section* by action of the OEA Executive Committee in commemoration of Mrs. Allen's dedication to the understanding and practice of human relations.

With some reorganization taking place in the Doris L. Allen Intercultural Relations Section, the design of the human relations brochure and guidelines booklet changed to reflect the general design of all Instruction and Professional Development Division publications (the four races design was retained, however, as an expression of Mrs. Allen's personal thrust to bring all cultures within the UTP family in Ohio together). As these publications have grown to nine in number, the OEA Human Relations thrust has been kept alive as three, out of the nine, now reflect OEA's commitment to Human Relations.

In summary, we here at the OEA Center in Columbus, Ohio, are now awaiting the dreams of our past to become the reality of all our tomorrows for if we are to ever realize our commitment to humanizing education for the third century, we must rededicate our efforts to the goal of establishing in every local school district across the state, a human relations component that will address those critical areas in education which require an understanding of, and an appreciation for the cultural diversity that makes us all unique in our own right.

Hopefully, this overview will put into chronological perspective from whence we have come as a human relations entity and where, with God's grace, we can go as an Association.

"Humanizing The Educational Environment For The Deprived Child"

by Charles A. Glatt (deceased)
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
and Founder-President
Foundation for Equality in Education

Educators are given to attaching labels to special concerns and interests that affect their profession: *Life adjustment education* is one such label. *Education of the whole child* is another. And *dropouts* is a third.

Life adjustment education had its heyday, as did education of the whole child. And enough has been written about dropouts to set the stage for a proper study of those who remain in school.

During the past few years, a new concern has taken its place beside the others. I am thinking of the problem -- rather difficult to label and more difficult to define -- of "culturally deprived children."

Since President Johnson's anti-poverty proposals were made to Congress, suggestions have been rampant that educators ought to be involved in the crusade to bring relief to depressed areas. In discussions of the war on poverty that is being waged in this country the expressions *culturally deprived* and *depressed areas* are often used. The expressions remind us that all Americans do not share equally in the fruits of the American dream. But how many thoughtful writers are satisfied with these labels?

A child does not have to be deprived culturally to receive only a small share of the benefits that ought to be the birthright of every American. A child may be deprived in other ways. Or he may be only *disadvantaged* . The word *disadvantaged* signifies perhaps a lesser evil than *deprived*. The terms, of course, are subject to interpretation, and writers and speakers differ in their interpretations. Riessman, for example, employs the expressions *culturally deprived, educationally deprived, deprived, lower class, underprivileged disadvantaged, and lower socio-economic group* interchangeably in his writings.

As a child, I was perhaps one of the culturally deprived. But then many children who grew up during the depression years were culturally deprived. As a teacher in the public schools, I have taught students who fit current definitions of the deprived. I have also had considerable workshop experience in

---

*From *The Elementary School Journal*, 65: 407-413; May, 1965. Reprinted from *"Who Are The Deprived Children!"* in *The Elementary School Journal* by Charles A. Glatt by permission of The University of Chicago Press. Copyright 1965 by The University of Chicago. Charles A. Glatt, now deceased, was Associate Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

dealing with cultural deprivation at the university level. Drawing on this background, I suggest that at least four propositions underlie the over-all concern with deprivation.

First, identification of deprived children may be difficult, but it is clear that some children are much more restricted in their experiential backgrounds, in their store of enriching memories, than other children are. Within the same neighborhood, the same schools, the same classroom, some students are affluent in qualities and characteristics that bespeak unstinted advantages; other students are almost bankrupt in these qualities.

Second, in America, we have not quite decided which is more desirable, a monocultural or a multicultural existence. (For example, if one wants to climb the social ladder, one is guided by the expectations of a particular culture.) At other times a diversity of heritage may be an asset. To label someone as *culturally deprived* is to attach importance to one way of life as compared with another. Actually, in one environment, a child may be wealthy in "subcultural" attributes. In another environment, the same child may be impoverished.

Third, educators who write and talk about the deprived child are dealing with a sensitive domain, as the proposition just stated suggests. Deprivation may be quite obviously related to certain ethnic and religious groups, to certain social classes and residential districts. But to say so is to invite a whirlwind of unfavorable reaction. Therefore, much of the literature on cultural deprivation is not so lucid as one might desire.

Fourth, deprivation is relative -- relative to the culture, to the social system, to one's in-group and to the out-groups, to the time, the place, the particular situation. One of the most difficult tasks involved in studying this problem is to arrive at norms. Can levels or standards be defined? Can the definitions then be used to categorize individuals? I contend that to derive such norms is not only difficult, perhaps even impossible, but also undesirable. I suggest rather that the first task is to identify the social and cultural influences that affect individual development. After this task has been accomplished, the behaviors that result from these influences can be identified. Once the influences and the behaviors have been identified, it will be easier to determine the kind of growth that is needed to overcome personal deprivation.

From my experiences with students, I do not believe that such terms as *culturally deprived* and *culturally disadvantaged* are needed in the educator's professional vocabulary. The need is to recognize that each of us is deprived or underdeveloped in some ways. What one person needs to grow and develop may not be what another needs. I have found several guidelines useful in assessing the growth needs of individuals.

The first guideline: the causes of deprivation in children are manifold. Some of the causes are common and often they can be easily identified. These include economic status, housing, previous formal education, physical and mental health, and access to religious instruction. Other reasons for differences among individuals are just as significant but less readily specified. These include family attitudes and values, use of free time, maturation, interests, appreciations, and accessibility of learning materials that supplement and enrich those available in the classroom -- art, books, music, movies, television, lectures.

The students who come into our schools bring with them diverse backgrounds that reflect differences based on these and other causes. Growth and development that occur in the classroom often tend to accentuate rather than to ameliorate such differences.

The second guideline: each child's background is unique, and each child's personal behavior is an expression of his unique background. The evidence we use to identify individual deprivation can usually be classified under the following categories of attitudes and behaviors: use of acceptable language; relations with others; and social amenities (dress, manners, gestures, toilet habits). Other categories include respect for property, personal beliefs, values, attitudes, preconceptions, appreciation for aesthetic experiences, and the ability to relate ideas with events and entities.

These are clues that can lead a prospective teacher to the causes of deprivation. The lists are not complete, but they suggest evidence that can be helpful in identifying areas of needed growth. The traits do not usually occur in isolation. Certain speech patterns, mannerisms, attitudes, and beliefs are commonly clustered and are associated with specific social classes, ethnic groups, economic levels, and family structures.

When Values Clash

Certainly conflict between opposing value systems is a basic factor in differential development. A child from a French home in southern Louisiana may be deprived in his use of the English language if only a French dialect is spoken at home. Navajo students from an Arizona reservation may hold values regarding property rights that are different from the values held by most Americans. A Catholic child may feel extremely uncomfortable if he is forced to sing hymns that express Protestant religious beliefs. Middle-class attitudes toward home-life may be meaningless to children of migrant workers. Attitudes toward thrift and economic self-sufficiency may mean nothing to a boy whose major ambition is to grow up and get his name on the welfare rolls, as his father did. Cafeteria courtesies may be alien in a home where food is never plentiful and second servings are unknown. Open-mindedness may be next to impossible for the daughter of a family whose religious or political commitments are so strong that they preclude objectivity on any issue.

Truthfulness may be no virtue to a child who has never considered lying a vice. Honesty may not be seen as the best policy by the lad who has been taught at home to steal. Purity may be a meaningless notion to a girl whose mother prostitutes herself. Love may hold no attraction for a child who has only been tolerated. The teacher who has insight into these differences is wise indeed.

Four Children

In my work with young people in the South, the West, and the Northeast, I have come to know the culture of many families. From my experience I would like to present portraits of four children. Other teachers across the nation, I am sure, have known boys and girls like these. From Frank, John, Lulu Mae, and Margaret Smith we can learn to look behind the label *culturally deprived* to the unique needs of a single child.

Frank is a Spanish-American boy in a Southwestern city. His father is on public relief. The family is Catholic and lives in a less desirable neighbor-

hood in a house that is long past the stage of just needing repairs. The four-room home has a radio, a television set, and many pulp magazines, but few books. Frank has three sisters and four brothers, all of whom live at home. Except for one week when the family visited relatives in rural Colorado, none of the children has ever been more than thirty miles from his neighborhood. The only English spoken in the home is profane: everyone knows and uses the four-letter words. Liquor, when available, is consumed freely by the parents and the older children, and the sex act requires no privacy. Pocket money for the children comes from odd jobs and petty thievery.

Is Frank's way of life at home the culture to be examined? If so, Frank is not deprived. His life is enriched by the experiences that have been forced upon him. Is the way of life taught and encouraged at Frank's school to be examined? If so, Frank is quite deprived. He has a strong in-group allegiance: his language is foul and coarse; his personality is acutely twisted and antagonistic; art and music as aesthetic interests leave him cold and unresponsive; his dress, his appearance, his haircut, and his toilet habits are not at all in accord with campus expectations; his attitudes toward property and other persons are unacceptable; he cannot relate ideas and events that he has not experienced. Frank's growth needs are quite evident to his middle-class, Anglo, Protestant teacher. To him, Frank is one of the culturally deprived.

More important, however, Frank is a marginal person; that is, he is not a fully participating member of any one social group. As he adopts the ways of the school, he becomes less at ease at home. As the family pressures him (through formal and informal means), he finds school life less and less acceptable. Like many others he may gradually reject either the one way of life or the other, but he will continue to be influenced by both.

John is typically American. Like Frank, he is in seventh grade. His father is an assistant manager of a manufacturing firm and a member of several civic organizations. His mother attends the "right" meetings and belongs to the acceptable clubs. They are Protestant. John is the second of three children. The family has traveled extensively; they attend "cultural" activities; and plans for higher education for each child have already been made. The family is successful, well fed, and lives in spacious surroundings. Basically no conflicts characterize the home and the school environments. Can John possibly be one of the deprived?

At first glance one should probably answer in the negative. As his teacher came to know John, however, certain traits that are not immediately obvious were revealed. John's language at home and in the classroom is not the same as his language on the playground. Most of the four-letter words Frank uses John also uses, but only when he is with his peer group. His exemplary behavior in the presence of adults changes when adults are absent. The pictures he draws and the verses he pens on walls of lavatories are a far cry from the art and the poetry to which he is exposed at home and in class. Frank could not care less about his school marks: John could not care less about how he makes his high marks. Cheating is acceptable: the only sin is being caught. John can relate ideas and events, but the relationships he draws in private are not in accord with the values and the beliefs he ostensibly holds.

Is John deprived? Does he need enrichment? Does he need new and different growth experiences? The reader can supply the answers. Frank is being forced

to learn a new way of life. John is choosing a new (and hopefully not a permanent) way of life which fits needs that are probably not comprehended by his parents or his teachers.

Each of these boys is deprived in his own way. Each needs supplemental experiences. Each is caught in a world of conflicting values and expectations from which escape is difficult.

Lulu Mae is Black and, by legal standards, illegitimate. In the Louisiana parish where she was born, Blacks know better than to apply for a marriage license. At best they would merely be ridiculed for making such a request; at worst they might be "taught a lesson" physically. Lulu Mae lives in a two-room shotgun shack in one of the several "Nigger Quarters" of the town where she, her mother, and several other children reside. The man who lives with her mother now is the third "daddy" that Lulu Mae recalls.

Food is never plentiful in the shack, which has only tar paper to keep the damp winter cold from coming through wide cracks in the walls. Only two beds can be seen: most of the children sleep on hard pallets on the floor. The stove, which also serves as a heater, burns woods, which is brought home each day from the lumber mill where "Daddy" works. No books, magazines, or newspapers can be found, except those that are laid under the cheap linoleum or that have been used as wallpaper in the front room. The family is regular in church attendance (Baptist), the only planned social activity in which they engage. Each of the older children has been "converted" and baptized in a nearby river.

Lulu Mae is the same chronological age as Frank and John, but in the two-room segregated school she attends she is barely doing fourth-grade work. No audio-visual aids can be seen there, and books of any kind are at a premium. Those that are available were sent over after they were no longer useful at the "white" elementary school.

By all measuring devices, Lula Mae is deprived. Unlike Frank, however, she is not becoming a marginal person. Her teacher, also a Black, is sensitive enough not to tease her students with unrealistic goals. Much of her teaching is oriented toward how black people can best get along in a white man's world.

Yet, Lulu Mae is wealthy in some respects. She knows about sex; she knows how babies are born and how to care for them; how to stay warm under thin blankets on a cold night; how to dig bait and catch catfish; how to say "Yes, suh" and "No, ma'am" with a toothy smile; how to wash clothes without a machine; how to cook collard greens, fatback and cornbread. She knows something about sewing and planting a garden. She knows how to go barefoot without getting stickers in her feet and how to make an ice-cream cone last a full ten minutes on a hot summer day.

She cannot do most of the things that John or even Frank can do in school, but they could not do many of the things she can do at home. She needs an enriched curriculum -- but only if her future is more promising than her mother's was. This year a pair of eyeglasses would help her work in school more than a new dress or a different book would, but no one in her family has ever owned glasses. The educator who wants a "specimen" for enrichment might well think seriously of the thousands of Lulu Maes throughout the land.

Margaret Smith (born Margarita Salmini) is -- or was -- Italian. Two years ago her parents moved from the Italian neighborhood, legally changed their names, and began making a new circle of friends. Margaret and her mother bleached their hair to an orange shade, while the males in the family got crew-cuts to replace the longer hair styles they had worn for years. Visits back to see relatives are becoming very rare.

The Smiths bought an encyclopedia and subscribed to several upper-middle-class magazines. Their new house is neat, the lawn is well trimmed, and the usual back-yard outdoor cooking equipment stands beneath a shade tree. Clothes, shoes, accessories -- all are in good taste, bought with the help and advice of friends who have also made the cultural switch the Smith family is making.

Margaret does well in school. She is an A student who is liked well by peers and teachers. No one at school thinks of her as Italian, but she lives with the fear that someday they might. She has learned to hate her old neighborhood and her former friends and she is careful to associate only with children of the dominant social group. Margaret and her family have deliberately chosen to deprive themselves of a cultural background in order to cope better with what to them is a more desirable way of life. In making this change, they have sacrificed lifetimes of informal learnings. Mr. and Mrs. Smith are under no delusions about their own escape from the ethnic stigma -- the break will not be complete for them. Their hope, however, is that their children will successfully make the great transition across subcultural lines without recurring problems.

Margarita's heritage was very rich; Margaret's heritage must begin anew. She has had many enriching experiences, but these must now be woven into the fabric of her new life. Fortunately, she will not be caught in school-home conflicts because her family depends in part on what she and her sisters learn at school for their new guideposts at home.

Deprivation And The School

Examples such as these are too numerous and too well known to merit further portrayal here. Certainly not all American children fit these descriptions. Each portrait is unique although each is, in many ways, similar to the others.

Some children are deprived of self-confidence, of a definite and well-defined role that is compatible with roles developed by their peers. Other children, including many upper-class boys and girls, are deprived of playmates, of friends, of understanding and appreciation. Still others lack skills, knowledge, pets, toys, and childhood myths.

The school cannot and should not try to assume responsibility for making up all the deficiencies in each child's life, but each educator is accountable for being aware of the differences. Moreover, it is incumbent upon members of the teaching profession to supplement previous experiences with new ones that properly fit the role of the school.

Enrichment, experiences, good education for all children -- these are legitimate and necessary concerns of the school. But before we, as educators, make our definitions complete, many and diverse factors must be considered. Lest we do more harm than good, we must carefully select the criteria by which deprived children are to be identified.

"HUMAN RIGHTS ARE INDIVISIBLE"

by Dr. Wilma Scott-Heide
Vice President
Women's Coalition For The Third Century
Boston, Massachusetts

I'm glad we no longer need to debate whether or not we should be advocates of human rights for all . . . of course, we should. But, I'll translate tools to resources because we need to think about human resources of advocacy and humans are not and never should have been tools. Before we can discuss human resources, we must establish some areas of agreement. So my first premise and continuing theme is that human rights are indivisible by any grouping of the human race. Next, there are many kinds of human rights.

One such right is the right to be considered as an individual, a person, whatever our race, sex, religion, ancestory, or age . . . that is indivisible. Our personhood cannot, must not be divided, defined, or denied by someone else. But, especially women and black people have been defined, our rights divided, and our personhood denied by sexism and racism, individual and institutionalized. Our language and thought symbolically reflects that reality.

Whatever the intent of phrases being used today, the practical effect on the consciousness of males and females, white and black is the positive value of white and male and negitive value of blacks and female. For black people to transcend these pervasive thought patterns and self images and translate to the reality that "Black is indeed beautiful," is a stroke of genious. Or, as a friend of mine once said: *"I'm not colored . . . I'm naturally Black."*

For women, the comparable step must be to ignore our androcentric language that equates man with human. For instance, man and his environment, man and his universe, man and his achievements, et.al, ad nauseam to the inevitable, actually used, and ultimate extreme. "Everyone should be able to decide for himself whether or not to have an abortion." They went much too far that time. While language patterns exclude the female and society has distorted our sexuality, and furthermore said our biology is our destiny: we must think and say: *"Women are people."* As people, we have a right to develop and apply our human intelligence however we choose. It is tragic that our reproductive abilities we share with all other mammals have been more highly valued and developed than our productive intelligence which we do not share with any other mammal. The cortex of the brain has no sex any more than it has a race-related color.

So, the human right to personhood independent of sex or race is indivisible and must be self-defined and preciously nutured. It cannot be nurtured in a society that does not value nurturance as a human (not an exclusive female) trait and deprive men of the development of nurturant potential, and confines

the nurturant abilities of women to family and secondary roles. Women and black people have always been presumed to have some b.f.o.q. (bona fide occupational qualification) for nurturance or care of others and their property. But the caring role, itself, is not valued highly in the marketplace; how well do we compensate women for housework and child care? And, isn't it interesting that the people assigned such roles are more noticed when they don't function according to their "job" description?

While this devaluing of the caring role and of those assigned to it by sex and skin color, is a fascinating phenomenon of our culture and very related to the criteria of determining status, I do not accept this as either a natural or a healthy phenomenon. This adversary system of human relationships is not all nor the best we can develop in human rights work or elsewhere. There are alternatives. For instance: Love (in the sense of caring about) is the only game at which two or more can play and everyone can "win." We will never learn how to play that game for real so long as we have race or sex supremacy myths, so long as we stereotype people by race and sex and force them to fit the mold irrespective of individuality. Being forced to fit someone else's mold, especially one that is devalued and limiting, produces resentment, frustration of self and other hate and some level of consciousness.

The first human inequality has been sexual inequality and it's learned first in most homes and elsewhere. The division of labor, the legal and social prerogatives, the expectation of developing adult competence not adjustment to dependency, the extension of that competency to and beyond the home, have been male prerogatives. To the extent black males have been socially and economically castrated, they have been grievously denied their manhood and society defined that manhood. If Black males have been castrated, Black females have been raped socially and physically by white men. Where is the white female all this time?

Undeniably, the white female has been materially more comfortable than her black sisters (and I do believe sisterhood as well as brotherhood transcends race, religion, nationality and individual parenthood). The chains of mink, of the momentary comforts of affluent "protection" from human problems of hunger, deprivation and degradation are powerful deterrents to motivation for humane concern and effective action. The socialization of most white women, north and south, to let George (translate "my husband") solve public problems so defines woman's potential by her sexuality, as to negate the ability of many white women to conceive let alone practice her nurturance and public problem-solving outside the home and often within the home as well. The chains of iron, of poverty, of struggle for survival have forced black women, out of necessity, to fight or to compete for those things not destroyed by the inhumane conditions in which they are forced to live.

To the extent they are related, racism will never be eradicated so long as sexism lives. Black women who survive the physical deprivation are more liberated than most white women. Unlike white women, black women have been taught to fight their oppression. That's only one reason why this woman's liberation movement has attracted more white than black women disproportionately. We need it more psychologically. My own admiration for black women, individually and collectively, includes Aileen Hernandez, Pauli Murray, Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, Florence Kennedy, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Shirley Chisholm and others

today and reaches back to Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Ida. B. Wells-Barnett, Mary McLeod Bethune, Mary Church Terrell, and others.

Women were never really "granted" the right to vote voluntarily. Our grandmothers fought, demonstrated, and died for this right in a struggle whose active protest took decades. It was women abolitionists who again initiated women's rights efforts when they were denied the right to speak out publicly against Negro slavery. As long as only 6 out of 800 full-length articles in the Journal of Negro History deal directly with black women, we will never know our leader models of the past. White history denies or ignores white women leaders even more. In fact, the word "history," in a word tells their story. Black men have been humiliated, distorted, exploited but at least taken into account. Women have been ignored and seldom have a public voice. Truthfully, if men ask me after a speech for equal time, I remind them and you that until women have access to the public forum, virtually uninterrupted for ten thousands of years, I don't care to have anyone speak to me about "equal time."

In our various commissions and agencies, we say and think discrimination hundreds of times daily. Discrimination is the predictable and inevitable consequence of race and sex stereotyping. All women and black men, after centuries-long denial of our adult personhood, have been reputed to be too emotional, childish, illogical, and unreliable for real responsibilities. This is the kind of institutional racism and sexism that can only result in self-fulfilling prophecies. No social institution and few, if any, individuals have ever completely escaped this pervasive, pernicious conditioning.

We must clearly understand that any discussion of women's interest, men's interest, of women's roles and men's roles, of white community and black community, tends to negate the transcending reality of human interests, human roles and human community. Yes, there are differences, male and female, white and black, differences in needs, and in our focus of efforts. But the difference must not be used to allow any group or individuals to dominate another. There is no need, however compelling, however gently advanced, that is so great as the need to reject racial or sexual politics. That's the politics of misused exploitive power. It is domination and submission themselves that are unhealthy bases of human relationships.

The price of sex bias is even greater than the horrendous economic and psychological cost of race bias. The black woman who is poor and without the partnership of a black man will never be reached by attention to and by priority programs for black men. Over 60% of the poor children in this country are completely dependent on the resources of women. Unemployment figures can only account for those unsuccessfully seeking work. Many women have long since given up the search. Whether Black or White, unemployment among women and girls is consistently higher than among men and boys.

Aside from the quantitative, economic costs of sexism and racism, the price of these phenomena exacted from the quality of our common life is even more telling and difficult to precisely document than one can imagine. The pretensions of white power are only exceeded by the arrogance of male power. There is a human revolution going on. By making and living these several subrevolutions of youth, blacks, poor and women, scales are being removed from our eyes. I think the women's rights and liberation movement may be bloodless and peaceful, like all other revolutions, at least to the degree

that we can see and advocate its legitimacy, its inevitability, and its necessity.

The hand that has rocked the cradle is now rocking the boat so that, in proportionate numbers, we intend to guide the ship of state and of the world. By the same token, men need the humanizing experience of nurturing, caring for a developing human organism. Those of you who are black have the particular potential to give us all refreshing egalitarian models of marriage and sexual politics. You have shared more equally in the hardship and the struggle. You know that the full participation of men and women is necessary for survival. The myth and the reality that behind every great man stands a woman must be replaced with the more mature model that for a society (not a man) to be great, women and men must work side by side (not one behind the other.)

To date, we have taught men to be brave and women to care. Now we must enlarge our concepts of bravery and caring. Men must be brave enough to care sensitively, compassionately and, contrary to the masculine mystique, about the quality and equality of our society. We as women must care enough about our families and all families to bravely assert our voice and our intellect into every aspect of every social institution whatever the "feminine mystique." Every social trait labelled masculine or feminine is in truth a human trait. It is our human right to develop and contribute our talents whatever our sex, race, religion, ancestry, or age. Human Rights are Indivisible. To deny the logic and the promise of equality is to be deprived of its rewards. It is a supreme compliment to you individually and to this Association collectively that I trust you with the capacity and the will to address yourself to everyone's human rights.

"Human Relations: A Pro-active Tool For Humanizing The Educational Environment"

by Phyllis B. Greer
Former Director of Human Relations
Dayton Public Schools (Retired)
and Vice President, Foundation
For Equality in Education

Almost since the beginning of time, it seems, we have talked about educational readiness. Before I enter into the more substantive content of my presentation, I'd like to give you a simple readiness test. "Are you ready to hear what I have to say to you?" "Good!" I'd like to have you to just look around you and determine -- with all the divergent opinions we've heard presented today, not withstanding the ideas and concepts that exist all along this continuum -- the one thing about which we can all agree at this point in time given this present experience. Would you be kind enough to answer this question for me please? Come now, what is the one thing that is common to all of us here? I don't hear any responses, so I take that to mean that you aren't ready. Hopefully, before I finish, you will be ready because I believe readiness to be much of what human relations is all about. I am, therefore, pleased to talk to and with you today because I feel that my topic is most relevant and certainly very important to what we, as educators, must be about if we are to foster a humane educational environment for our students.

Human Relations: A Pro-active Tool for Humanizing The Educational Environment

I would like to cite, for your consideration, three basic concepts that affect our perceptions about a number of things after which I would like to discuss the implications and ramifications for humanizing education. Those three concepts are (1) hindsight, (2) insight, and most important (3) foresight.

We know that *hindsight* is the perception of events after they occur which seems to be where most of us have been functioning. We should know what *insight* means and that's what I hope to develop for you during this presentation. *Foresight*, or that which some of you may call awareness, is that which we can see and/or conceptualize beforehand in order that we may be able to plan ahead.

Now, with these definitions in mind, let's take a look at *hindsight*. In many school systems today, we have more materials than we have ever had before. While this may not be true in your specific school building or classroom, I do know of schools into which I can go and find materials -- new texts and curricular supplements -- gathering dust on the shelves. *Hindsight*? Even with the so-called teacher surplus, due to declining student enrollment and various fiscal and political problems, we have better trained teachers than we've ever had before. We have more highly touted educational programs than we have ever had before -- new reading programs, math programs, and social studies programs not to mention the facilities such as math labs and reading labs that house these programs.

We have more support services than we've ever had before. We have all of these programs, facilities, and services in our public schools and yet children are not learning. The trust level is low, not only between teacher and student, but also between student and student; teacher and teacher; and between administration and staff. In short, the trust level between the community and the school is low and the level of hostility is great. Something is missing. Is it *hindsight?*

We hear a lot about integration and desegregation today and I mention it here today because I've been personally involved in it for quite some time and can share some first-hand experiences about the phenomenon of trust as it relates to the maintenance of rapport between the community and the school.

White Plain, for instance, has often been touted as a school system that voluntarily desegregated its students and staff. No one had to tell them to do it; they did it because it was educationally feasible and morally sound. The program went along beautifully for a number of years and then suddenly all hell broke loose in the system. They took a look at that school system, with its enclaves of majority students and staff going about their business and the enclaves of minority students and staff going about their business and could find no real problem area; yet all hell had broken loose. There was something missing . . . *hindsight?*

I have a little story that I tell as it was told to me -- that dramatizes this certain something that is missing. With your indulgence, I'd like to share that story with you. For the lack of another name, I call it the Mississippi Mama Story because it happened in Mississippi and it happened way back when the schools were first integrated. This story was originally told by a white principal. Now when you hear me talking about whites and Blacks, let us not forget all the other minority groups whose situations could be dramatized by the same analogies that I am drawing. It just happened to take place in Mississippi between a white administrator and a Black mother.

> *A Black young lady was sent across town to "the better school." Her mother, a domestic, worked hard every day and said continuously to her daughter, "Now I want you to go over to that school and whatever they tell you to do , I want you to do it, 'cause you got to go there an' education is the most important thing in your life." The young lady went to that school and came home one evening with a note saying that she was suspended and that the mother would have to come back with her the next day. The mother said, "I can't go with you tomorrow, child. I've got to go to work." Since this mother felt that the school was always right, she called the school and said, "I can't come to the school tomorrow, I've got to go to work. I've talked to this child an' she's a good child, can I sent her back?" The principal said, "Yes, you can send her back if she apologizes to the teacher." The mother assured the principal that her daughter would, and the next day the young lady went back to school. About three o'clock that afternoon, the mother received a telephone call. The call was a tragic one because it told her about a drowning . . . her daughter was dead.*

If I failed to mention it before beginning this story, let me tell you now, that this is a true story. This actually happened in a small town in Mississippi.

This mother went home that evening and found a note on her dresser written by her daughter. In her limited use of the English language, her daughter expressed as clearly as she could what had happened to her at school. What she said was this:

> *"Mama, I went back to the school an' I tried to apologize but the teacher wouldn't listen. You told me not to come back home . . . but to stay in that school, so I didn't have no place to go."*

The child had taken her own life! The next day, the mother went to the school with the note and asked the principal what the problem was. She was told that the young lady called the teacher a bad name. That white principal tells this story with tears in his eyes because I really believe that at that moment, he found that missing ingredient.

> *The principal told the mother what had happened. He told her how her daughter was in the classroom, how a boy in front of her kept moving his seat back into her leg, and how this caused her daughter to raise her hand seeking the teacher's attention.*

We all know -- from personal experience -- what that raised hand was . . . it wasn't just to get attention, it was a signal of distress.

> *The teacher responded to that raised hand by telling her to shut up and to put her hand down. The young lady kept raising her hand until, in desperation, she blurted out, "this boy is hurting my leg!" In reply, the teacher shouted back, "get out of here" and the girl, in leaving, called the teacher a name. The mother looked at the principal as he began defending the school's posture and said, "there was nothing we could do about it. We didn't do anything to her; she decided that in her own mind." The mother replied, with tear-filled eyes -- "Oh yes, Mr. Principal, you could have done something about it. Somebody could have treated her like a <u>human being</u> and if there is an <u>Accountant</u> anywhere, you have got to account to Him for what happened to my daughter." That mother went out and got a group of community folks together who began to go into that school and to look for the kinds of things -- the <u>dehumanizing</u> kinds of things that were happening to youngsters. The principal, in relating this story said, "it was only then that we began to realize that we were dealing with <u>human beings</u>."*

That <u>Mississippi Mama</u> lives today in school districts all over the face of this great nation. She's the Appalachian mother whose child is not treated like a human being. She's the Chicano mother whose child is not treated like a human being. She's the Indian mother on the reservation whose child is not treated like a human being. She's the mother of every child who goes into a school where we, as professional educators, are not ready to recognize the one common thing that all of us have. Even, in this learned group, we didn't have it.

Look at us all . . . we start from a very common point. Each one of us is a human being who angers, who feels, who hurts, who cries, and who has basic needs. Each one of us, after all, is a human being and that recognition, for your information, is *insight*.

I submit to all of you that this is what was missing in White Plain. I say that because two-thirds (2/3) of their money today is being spent on human relations activities -- pro-active human relations activities -- designed to re-create and to humanize a better learning environment. Most of us will agree that it's very simplistic to say, "I believe that we are all human beings; I believe that!" We verbalize positive human relationships knowing that all this is, is just the interaction that takes place among human beings. We say this and it even appears that, many times, we even believe it but let's look at some of the hidden agendas. Let's see how much we really mean what we say. This is how we all can begin to develop some insight into this whole area of human relations.

I don't know how many of you saw the stage play, *"Don't Bother Me, I Can't Cope,"* but there are a few lines from one of the show's songs that, to me, points out what I have been talking about. It goes something like this:

> *He wouldn't hurt a flea, and if a fly lit on his nose, he'd let it be. Well, maybe I'm just stupid, but I just can't understand why that same man wouldn't even shake my hand.*

Human relations? Do we really mean it?

Another Hidden Agenda?

We hear in our classrooms, especially those classrooms where we have youngsters who are different from the administration and/or the teaching staff, the statement, "You know, I don't see color, I just see people." That is a gross insult! It is an insult because, as a human being, I recognize that sameness but beyond that sameness, I cannot deny that there are some differences. There are differences for the Mexican-American child; there are differences for the Puerto-Rican child; there are differences for the Asian-Americans; and there are differences for Black folk.

See me, America, because bound up in my color are different sets of life styles and value systems. See my differences; don't make me an invisible person because if I am invisible, how can you deal with my needs? I submit to you that this is human relations . . . this is the pro-active involvement that we must recognize and to which we must all address our energies.

If you see a hand waving from a midst of students in your classrooms, in your church activities, and/or in your home environment, do not ignore it; recognize it for what it may be trying to say. It may be a signal that is saying, (a) don't deny that my differences exist; (b) see what I am; (c) help me to see my own self-worth; and (d) help me to develop self-value for I cannot feel good about myself if nobody sees me. We must watch out for all of these things and more; some children may only have time for one signal before they go under and are lost forever.

We have all heard it said and perhaps many of us are guilty of saying, "all children are the same." All children <u>are not</u> the same. All children, it is said, start out the same with the same biological process as a part of their growth and development, but as we go along, some different things happen to us that make us different people. To say then, that we are all the same, is basically not true.

Value systems, life, styles, educational needs, and social needs are all areas of human relations that must be recognized if we are going to move off dead center in every area of human interaction spoken to, here today.

I would like to take these last few minutes to talk about what is believed to be an undergirding concept in this area of human relationships.

We have talked about developing insights, but I wonder if we have developed the kind of insights relative to conceptualizing the part that communication plays in establishing and maintaining human relationships. Think about the teacher who comes into the classroom and says to a new class:

> *"Good morning class; I'm glad that you're all here. I like children and intend to do the best for all of you. This is a classroom where everyone stays in his/her seat. This is a classroom where we don't talk . . . but I like all children."*

What *insight* does that give you about communication? Does it say to you that communication is two way? If you look in your dictionary, I don't think you will find a definition that fails to indicate that communication is two way. Yet, this is the kind of dehumanizing atmosphere that is established in classroom after classroom almost immediately with the start of each new school year.

Man is a communicator. I wonder how many of us recognize why we communicate. I found a definition that turns me on because I think it's so true. *Man, as a communicator, is seeking to establish his survival.* It goes on to say that his survival as well as the quality of his survival depends on communication. Haven't you heard that <u>here</u> today?

The child, for instance, who goes to school unable to use the language in which he is expected to learn and who already is set back, is going to learn because he's going to establish some other kind of communicative device in order to survive. The most basic organism has survival skills. Birds have their mating calls; bees know how to tell the other bees in what direction the clover is located; a dog can tell you to stay off his turf beautifully and you know the signs. Human beings throw up some other kinds of signs to communicate. The human signal is what we are talking about and in human communication, as well as animal communication, the object is survival whether it be simple or sophisticated. The purpose is to alert the other organisms that an adjustment to the environment is being made and that life will go on. In many instances, it's just not too good to have a life where there is an absense of human relationships. Afterall, no man is an island.

There are three skill or need areas that relate to these survival techniques. Our very first need is personal need. We are social beings and we must learn to live with each other. Many people, talking from their own experiental backgrounds (from their own vantage point) have said to me, "You can talk about that, Mrs. Greer, because you've made it; but it's difficult for us because, you see, we haven't learned to live with other people." Well, yes, I guess it is easy for me, because from the time I was born, I had to develop coping skills to live in the white world. When I got on the bus, I had to learn the "white experience." When I got downtown to shop, I had to learn the "white experience," when I got into the school system, I had to learn the "white experience." Some of us are just learning that there are other experiences in the process of growing and developing

that we can know about because we are being forced into a situation where we have to live together. We've got to know the kinds of hurt, anxieties, frustrations, and needs that come from the Mexican-American child; from the Chicano child; from the Indian child; from the Puerto-Rican child; and yes, indeed, from the Black youngsters.

I've heard it said that our second need is to communicate positively. Because of our vocations, we need to get a job; we need to earn a living. There's a very definite need to communicate. As has been pointed out, we send young people out, not even able to use the language in which they're going to have to communicate; it's criminal.

Then there's the political need! We really need to communicate in terms of the problems of government. All the problems that we are facing now -- poverty, inflation, pollution, human and civil rights, and loss of property -- cannot be solved without effective communications.

Let me share with you some kinds of communications; many of you already know what they are. For instance, there are verbal and non-verbal types of communication skills. Do you realize that sixty-five percent (65%) of our communication takes place through tone of voice, gestures, posture, movement of eyebrows and so forth? Just a while back, I was talking about some of the coping skills that these youngsters develop. If you turn a child off by not treating him or her like a human being or by not recognizing his or her needs, you can be sure that you'll get the message. All you have to do is look at that child's non-verbal behavior. If you teach children, especially young women, not to verbalize back to you, what they think about you, they can give you a twitch of the shoulder that will certainly do it. It tells you, "Get off my back; leave me alone!" The youngster who slouches down in the chair during the third year of school and says nothing, has led many of us to say " . . . those kids come to us and they can't even speak English; they won't even communicate." I submit that if you perceive them as human beings, you will have built in communication skills. A smile, when they come in, a tactile kind of communication when children come into the class, to let them know that they are accepted are the kinds of things that we have failed to do in the past. Even if we can't verbalize, remember that only thirty-five percent (35%) comes from verbal communication. You can get that child, however, into other areas of being accepted by some other kinds of communication. We communicate with signs. You know, we have the "peace" sign, but we also know what half of the "peace" sign means. We communicate with over 700,000 distinct signs and that's why communication has become the undergirding concept of human relations.

The way a person dresses, the cut of one's hair, all of these are a part of the communicative process that we use.

Now what about verbal skills? Man is the only language-manipulating animal and I think it's important that we recognize that. We are really hung up, especially in education, with the idea that the meaning of our verbal language ought to be understood and accepted by everybody to whom we are talking. We are the senders who send out this beautiful, verbal language and who expect it to be decoded, understood, and the message adequately received. Well, that *ain't* necessarily so!

There was a little youngster in the first grade in a school where I taught who had an older teacher. This youngster had a terrific way of communicating; he could talk but the teacher didn't like the way he talked. She brought him up to me one day, because I worked with the little youngsters in terms of their adjustment to school; she was literally tugging him by his ear and said to him, "Now you tell her what you said!" What he told me that he said was rather interesting, to say the least. Usually, I use all of the words, but since this presentation is being taped, I'd better not. Anyway, he had called a little fellow a *"G.D.M.F.S.O.B."* I said, "Oh my goodness, why in the world did you say that?" And he replied, "'cause I was mad!" I said, "Well, I can tell you some other things to say if you're mad; when you're mad, you just pound the desk and you say . . . aw SUGAR!" He replied, "That ain't what my mama says to my daddy when she's mad!"

What did that string of invectives mean to him? Anger! That is simply all that it meant. Did you get that message? Or did you get the message that so many others receive -- that here is a filthy-minded little first-grade child who ought to be thrown out of school because he curses?

We've got to recognize that meanings are in people, not in words. That little story dramatizes it. Another thing that shows us that meanings are in people and not in words, is that each one of us projects our own experiences into the words-- it's our own personal meaning for every one of those words. Proof of that might be evidenced by this interesting piece of research.

In a survey conducted recently, a group of behavorial scientists listened to youngsters saying the *Lord's Prayer* and here are some of the phrases that they heard:

> *"Our Father, Harold be thy name"* (Harold -- he had a brother named Harold).
> *"Give us this day, our jelly bread"* (his own personal experience caused him to say that). Or the little fellow from New York who was heard to say *"Lead us not into Penn Station."* (That's what he heard!)

Another one . . . A New York plumber of foreign extraction wrote to the National Bureau of Standards and said that he had found that hydrochloric acid had opened drains quickly and that he wanted to know if it was good to use hydrochloric acid. He received this answer:

> *"The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable, but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence."*

He got the letter, looked at it, and wrote back saying "thanks for letting me know that it was all right." The Junior Scientist that had written the original reply was really upset by the plumber's letter and went to the Senior Partner with his problem. He said "Look, this man doesn't understand what I'm talking about; we don't seem to be communicating. He sent this letter saying 'thanks for telling me it's alright' and it's not alright." The Senior Partner, however, solved the problem. He sent a letter to the plumber which said *"Don't use hydrochloric acid . . . it eats the hell out of pipe."* He got the message across.

In verbal language, there is always a para-language -- a "vocal" non-verbal language. As not to confuse "verbal" with "vocal", let me make this clarification. Verbal is when we use the words; vocal is the tone of the voice and all the mannerisms, facial and otherwise that say, by way of implication, far more than what you really are saying. They get more meaning out of the para-language than they do out of the "verbal" language.

Let's recognize that in this whole area of human relations, there is a change that occurs in people. We must recognize that everybody, in terms of this whole continuum of developing interpersonal relationships, is changing in terms of the experiences that they are having with the others with whom they are thrown in contact.

In summation, it was difficult to decide what to throw out because there was so much more that I wanted to say, however, I think I have highlighted the fact that human relations -- the interpersonal relationships existing between people -- requires not a passive, but an active commitment to develop a more positive and humane environment where learning for all children can take place.

We must understand that first of all, we are all human beings and that is a starting point. We do have differences that we must recognize if we are to go on past all of these kinds of things. We must acknowledge communication as the undergirding element in the establishment of positive human relations on the levels where we find one another. If we do this with the adults with whom we work; if we do it especially with our children; and if we, as the sender, recognize the needs of the receiver, the receiver will experience success and acceptance. He will not send back to you rejection because all of the kinds of skills that we have been talking about today are two-way. Believe me, that receiver is going to send back just what he gets in terms of how he feels about what you mean to say and do. Acceptance, not rejection, will be what you will get back. That acceptance, in the human relations field, leads to trust. Trust leads to openness and openness leads to understanding. Understanding leads to involvement; involvement leads to learning; and, hopefully, learning is what we are all about if we are to live and work together.

Mrs. Greer was born and reared in Dayton, Ohio. She graduated from Paul Laurence Dunbar High School, an all Black high school in Dayton, and received her Bachelorate in Education from Wilberforce University in Wilberforce, Ohio. She received her Master's Degree from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio and has served in the Dayton School System as both an Elementary and a High School teacher. She has also been an Elementary Principal and retired in January of 1976 from the Dayton School System as Director of Human Relations.

Mrs. Greer has served as a presenter and facilitator at numerous Human Relations Workshops and Conferences. In 1976, she won the OEA Human Relations Commission Award for outstanding achievement rendered in the area of human relations by an individual educator within the United Teaching Profession.

This monograph features taped excerpts from a presentation given by Mrs. Greer at the 1976 OEA Winter Human Relations Conference held in Columbus, Ohio on February 7, 1976.